



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In the main the argument of the book appeals to me strongly, and I am prepared to accept its conclusions. To be sure, I think that we must see more anapisms than Mr. Leaf admits, though not to an extent which would imperil the validity of his argument. In part this comes from the fact that, even after studying his fourth chapter, I must agree with Robert's identification of the Skaian with the east gate, which Mr. Leaf calls an "ingenious but hopeless attempt". The claim of great antiquity for the Trojan catalogue should not occasion now the surprise which it would have caused a few years ago. The most serious difficulty raised by the book is how the original presence of the Lykians in the story is to be reconciled with the late date of all the episodes in which they figure. However that is a question for the future.

Two subsidiary questions—the Pelasgian Name, Sestos and Abydos—are the subject of the final chapters. Etymologically the connection of Πελασγοί and πέλας is impossible. We must start with *πελαγσ-κοι, "the people of the plain" (*cf.* Kretschmer, *Glotta*, I. 16 ff.), an etymology which could be combined with Mr. Leaf's main idea of the shifting meaning of the name.

Finally, it is well to call attention in the REVIEW to the third chapter, which Mr. Leaf modestly describes as little more than a précis of Doerpfeld's great work. It is the only satisfactory account of the remains at Hissarlik which we possess in English, and will undoubtedly prove, as the author hopes, sufficient for any but the specialist. Indeed, on account of its clearness and its power of grasping the essential points, it is a valuable approach to the question for anyone.

G. M. BOLLING.

La Bretagne Romaine. Par FRANÇOIS SAGOT, Docteur en Droit et ès-Lettres. (Paris: Fontemoing et Cie. 1911. Pp. xviii, 417.)

THIS book is the first comprehensive treatment of Roman Britain from the standpoints of both history and archaeology. While not definitive, the prospects of excavation considered, it constitutes a basis for any future work in the Romano-British field. Almost every phase of the subject is covered, the only noticeable omission being a statement of the scanty information forthcoming on British Christianity.

The work, which is provided with one good map, consists of four parts: I. The conquest, Caesar to Agricola; II. The second and third centuries, chronicle of events, provincial administration, military organization, and municipal traces; III. The fourth century, chronicle, new régime, period of highest prosperity probably 250–350, decline after Julian, and the evacuation; IV. The economic and social life.

The conclusion is a neat recapitulation, reproducing however, occasionally in an unqualified form, views advanced more guardedly in the course of the book. There is an index of proper names, but no general index.

The subject offers great temptations to building much on little. M. Sagot is cautious, but yields sometimes, as in his defense of the imperial policy in occupying Britain. In default of one good reason for Claudius's action, he advances half a dozen poor ones.

Resting on poets' fancies, he follows Mommsen's view that Augustus considered Britain's subjugation necessary. Von Ranke regarded Claudius's move as "contrary to the principles of Augustus and Tiberius", and M. Sagot himself is half minded to prefer Strabo's authority to that of Horace (p. 25).

Of the Trinovantes he says (p. 32): "Leurs souverains étaient à même d'exercer en Gaule une influence sérieuse", but offers no proof. "La Bretagne constituait un foyer d'influence celtique", etc. (p. 32). M. Sagot goes on to express his faith in a Druidism centred in Britain. On the point of a Celtic race in Britain Tacitus was less clear than Mommsen or Sagot. Of British Druidism, Geoffrey of Monmouth and Layamon do not seem to have heard. The divergent theories of the Druidists are all so weakly based that the historian may disregard Druidism as a cause of the invasion of 43.

Economically and strategically the conquest was a mistake; its apologists must make much of racial and religious notions that did not occur to the ancient historians of the event. M. Sagot admits (p. 75) that Domitian and his successors were influenced by the opinion which Appian expresses, that Britain was an unprofitable possession. He is also somewhat impressed with the obvious fact that the occupation of Britain spoilt Augustus's plan of the Elbe frontier (pp. 31, 38, 368). It weakened the empire without compensation. As various writers, *e. g.*, Furneaux and Jung, have indicated, Gaul was pacified long before 43 A. D. and was then in full tide of Romanization; no ancient writer says that Britain was conquered in order to secure Gaul.

While not going so far as Mr. Haverfield in his general conclusions on the degree of Romanization effected in Britain (pp. 232, 276, 374), M. Sagot occasionally in following his monographs drops exaggerated observations on this head. Really the "Romani" were always a people apart in Britain, as Gildas and Bede indicate. Some Celts spoke Latin as some Hindus speak English; but not a Latin inscription found post-dates 408 A. D. (p. 381).

A vast industry has been put into the book. Some remarks on Irish invasions of western Britain are interesting. The account of the military organization and economic life is surprisingly full and marked by accurate and finished scholarship. It is a great book, comparable to Cagnat's work on Roman Africa.

W. F. TAMBLYN.